Vol. XVII, No. 16 — Section III HUMAN EVENTS April 21, 1960

The United Nations

A Failure Or a Calculated Trap for the US?

By EDNA FLUEGEL

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO the United Nations was launched at San Francisco. It had elaborate "purposes and principles," but its primary function was the maintenance of peace by force if necessary. Membership on the part of the United States involved the renunciation of its historically successful policy of freedom of choice to serve its own interests by "going it alone" or by temporary alliances. Although the United States was then, beyond question or challenge, the paramount world power, a strange combination of hopes and fears merged to produce and to sell the illusion that America could find security only in collectivity.

Today, 15 years later, the abysmal failure of the United Nations to achieve its paramount objective, as far as the United States is concerned, is dramatically and tragically clarified by the fact that the United States is en route to another summit meeting, a meeting that is proof that security has not been achieved.

Is the United Nations only a failure? Or is it, for the United States, an actual or potential death-trap? If it is only a failure, the daily recommendations for "activation" *a la* Humphrey, Eleanor Roosevelt, etc.—or even the incredible Herter proposal for vesting in it more military power than any individual country possesses—are understandable as cover-up and campaign oratory, though completely unacceptable. If, on the other hand, the United Nations is a potential death-trap for the United States, these and other proposals for "building up the United Nations" are, designedly or not, calculated to spring the trap.

The answer is to be found in the membership of the United Nations—what it was, how it changed, what it signifies today, what it portends for the future. There were 51 Charter Members in 1945. Today there are 82 Members. Is the United States more or less powerful in the United Nations today than it was in 1945? Will the next admissions (20 to 30 are looming possibilities and some authorities refer to 120 "nations") enhance or diminish the American position? What is the significance of a report on March 11 that 48 (of the present 82) Members seek UNICEF funds?

Fifteen years ago the American people were told that the appeasement involved in separate membership for the Ukraine and for Byelorussia was unimportant since this would only give Russia three votes. How those votes have grown! Later admissions were supposed to "balance," a mathematical formula that led to the "package deal" of 1955. The trouble is that the Soviet Union controls its Members—and frequently "ours" as well. The terms "Free World" and "Communist World" obscure the real picture since the "Free World" is everything that is not formally and totally committed to Russia. Nations vote on issues; issues deal with immediate interests. Nations, like politicians, vote their hopes and fears and rarely, unless "party discipline" is absolute, do they sacrifice the present "getting" or the short-run "avoiding." This means that an increasing number of so-called Free World Members either vote with the Communist World or abstain.

The question of membership was much discussed prior to San Francisco and there were three schools of thought among the planners. One group favored universality and won over another which experimented with the possibility of weighted votes designed to give plural votes roughly corresponding to the power (numbers, economic and military strength, etc.) individual Members represented. Winston Churchill, aware of the absurdity of the first and the difficulties and dangers of the second, tried to introduce the idea of an over-all organization representing regional groupings, but was defeated. Universality was adopted as a goal and, even at the beginning, states-by-courtesy were included among the Charter Members.

These Charter Members consisted of states that were invaded, states that were not invaded but that declared war on one or more of the Axis nations, and Members by agreement. Initially, 26 signed the wartime United Nations Declarations of January, 1942:

United States, United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, Republic of China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, Union of South Africa, Yugoslavia. France and Denmark, both occupied, had no recognized government-in-exile at the time and the President of the Philippines was on Corregidor. The Philippines later adhered, the French were recognized and signed, and Denmark was voted in at San Francisco. Three nations never considered, though they continue to be recognized by the United States, are the Republics of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. The Soviet Union subsequently attempted, after absorbing these states, to have them recognized as People's Democracies.

At Yalta, membership discussions were held and decisions were reached both in terms of prior invitations and action at the scheduled San Francisco Conference. Even at this stage great power politics and friendships were reflected in the invitations and some of the "states" were states by anticipation only.

The Members at the Charter Conference were: United States, Republic of China, France, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia. Argentina, Denmark, Ukraine, Byelorussia were admitted during the

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conference and a charter place was reserved for Poland which lacked a government.

It should be noted that the "governments" of Poland and Yugoslavia had already become pro-Soviet and that Soviet influence over Czechoslovakia was growing. The first "hard core" bloc of Soviet votes in this Charter group of 51 was: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Yugoslavia—with the frequent addition of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Early voting in the United Nations was studded with 4 to 6 "noes." The United States had a "hard core" of 20 Latin American votes plus, as a rule, China, Philippines, Turkey, Liberia, Ethiopia. The Commonwealth bloc of six, the Western Europe bloc of seven and the Near East bloc of six could be counted on for questions involving major East-West issues. The vote was so consistently 45-6 on major issues that we sometimes avoided pressing matters to "save face" for the Russians! Recent votes on questions like the admission of Red China indicate the extent to which we have lost influence even with this initial group of Members.

In the first five years of its existence, only nine members were added: Afghanistan, Iceland, Sweden, Thailand in 1946; Pakistan and Yemen in 1947; Burma in 1948; Israel in 1949; Indonesia in 1950. In each instance, admission was possible only because of "balance" or because both the United States and the Soviet Union hoped through support of admission to gain influence. The "balance" proved to be favorable to to the Soviet. Between 1950 and 1955 the membership stayed at 60 as the struggle for power blocked further admissions until, in the wake of Geneva, the "package deal" which had been building up for years was effected. Again the votes were supposed to balance; again the balance favored the Russians.

This deal added 16 members: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, Rumania, Spain.

Note how these additions changed the geographical picture, diminished the role of Latin America, and introduced major voting uncertainties just before the crises over Suez and Hungary. Four more Members were admitted in 1956: Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, Japan. All four countries were being wooed by both the United States and the Soviet Union. Ghana and Malaya were admitted in 1957 for the same reason.

The total then stood at 82 but dropped one the next year when Egypt and Syria merged to become the United Arab Republic. Guinea was next admitted, bringing the membership figure back to 82. There it stands with further expansion via both "balance" and "wooing" practically inevitable. This expansion has already raised serious questions of geographical representativeness in the Security Council membership, both permanent and elective, and pressure for expansion of the Security Council is building up. These demands are logical, even in terms of the present Members—though dangerous to the United States. Indeed the process has gone so far that it is by no means fantastic to visualize the United States in the voting minority position that was Russia's in 1946—with the important difference that Russia will use its power.

It is submitted that the above factual recounting of the evolution of United Nations membership, plus a quick look at the map to ascertain the future "states," fully supports the conclusion that the United States should not, dares not "build up the United Nations." What, then, should we do? American withdrawal would be perilous until and unless a major issue provides popular justification. The best present hope of safeguarding American interests is to "drag our feet," to adopt a policy directly opposite to that recommended by ambitious politicians and vested-interest internationalists who, having driven the rest of us down a dead-end street to a drop-off, now insist there is no other "brave," "enlightened," "progressive," "sporting" thing to do except to advance and hope for the best. It is still possible to stop, to inch back, to maneuver, and to wait for a chance to back out safely.

THE UNITED NATIONS, even during the safe period of American dominance, failed to achieve its objectives —and the actions of both Administrations in concocting extra-United Nations machinery show this. Even the friends of the United Nations who are currently trying to activate it *via* proposals to increase the power of the World Court and establish a world police force attest its failure after 15 years. Ironically enough, the grimmest contemporary account of the 1960 world of the United Nations comes, not from an "isolationist" or a "reactionary," but from Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright! Here is what he said on March 4:

"Men have anciently yearned for a universal commonwealth. Now we have it of sorts. But it is a commonwealth of fear kept going by a precarious balance of terror, a chilling oscillation between negotiation and incineration. We endure in an era of total crisis . . . . All the world's parts, for the first time, are simultaneously out of joint . . . . Where do we stand? What is our so-called peace? Is it not a monstrous make-believe to which men lend credence so that thereby they may have the prospect of another day under the sun?"

Are the proposals for strengthening the United Nations more of this "monstrous make-believe?" Where will it end? This is the point at which we have arrived in 15 years of the United Nations—a "so-called peace" and a "commonwealth of fear." If the present trend continues, if the membership is expanded and if the United Nations is further empowered, it may finally succeed in maintaining peace by force if necessary—but it will be the peace and security imposed by the only great power that has used and abused the United Nations to gain time, votes, and influence—the Soviet Union.

Dr. Edna Fluegel is a professor and Chairman of the Department of Political Science at Trinity College, Washington, D. C.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.
Send me _____ reprints of "THE UNITED NATIONS" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____
Street _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 10, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Article Section I

Kennedy's Record Is Like Humphrey's

By WILLARD EDWARDS
(Capitol Hill correspondent for the Chicago Tribune)

SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts is not easily startled. But an idle question aroused him recently to shocked amazement, tinged with horror.

The Senator was aboard a press bus careening along an icy road near Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, in mid-February. He was relaxed and cheerful over reports that he was doing very well in stumping the state against Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota in their quest of convention votes for the Democratic Presidential nomination.

Newspapermen following the campaign tour began probing Kennedy on his strategy.

"Why don't you ever refer to Humphrey's voting record?" one of them asked, casually.

Kennedy recoiled as if from a treacherous attack.

"Voting record!" he snapped. "Why should I bring up his voting record? Then he'd bring up mine. What good would it do for me to chew him up or for him to chew me up?"

The incident escaped recording in most newspapers. Kennedy's response was accepted as a proper one, based upon the practicalities of politics. But his alarm implied interesting possibilities in a survey of the voting records of the two candidates.

That implication has been amply fulfilled in an analysis of the Kennedy-Humphrey voting records over the past eight years. Among the illuminating disclosures:

1. If Humphrey—as none, including the voluble ex-druggist himself, would dispute—is a flaming "liberal," then the fire of socialism burns no less brightly in the breast of the Senator from Massachusetts.

2. Kennedy could find nothing in the Senate roll calls of the last two years with which to lacerate Humphrey without wounding himself. Their voting records are almost identical.

3. The real reason for Kennedy's fear of voting record discussions is that they would destroy the public image he has been successfully fostering for many years—that of a modern independent, "liberal" in views but veering at times toward conservatism.

4. Kennedy, unlike most men who find themselves becoming more conservative with the passage of years, is now far more "liberal" than when he was a Senate freshman.

Kennedy's excuse for avoiding references to voting records in the Wisconsin primary is thus revealed as lacking in candor, to use a kindly expression. But his panic at the suggestion was genuine. He saw a threat to a cherished strategy which has served him magnificently in past elections.

Kennedy's voting record, somehow, has never been featured in his campaigns for office. He obviously wants to keep it that way.

In his 1958 campaign, he achieved a feat which, as far as investigation can determine, is unexampled in modern politics.

He earned the endorsement of the Massachusetts Americans for Democratic Action in the same week that he landed the enthusiastic support of a staunch Republican newspaper, the Boston *Herald,* which had gone on record as looking upon an ADA endorsement as somewhat equivalent to a stamp of approval from Nikita Khrushchev.

As a result, Kennedy was re-elected to the Senate, polling 1,362,926 votes, 73.6 per cent of those voting, rolling up a plurality of more than 870,000, the largest of any candidate from either party in the history of Massachusetts.

SIX YEARS EARLIER, in his first campaign for the Senate, he had recorded an equally astounding victory. He defeated Henry Cabot Lodge, Ike's right hand man, and was the only Democratic candidate in the state to breast the Eisenhower landslide of that year.

He obviously garnered a sizeable conservative vote from both major parties in the two contests. It is equally obvious that he hopes to win the same conservatives to his side in 1960 by maintaining the popular impression that he's a level-headed young fellow, faintly conservative at times, and certainly not a left-winger of the Humphrey stripe.

The red-hot "liberals" have never been confused about Kennedy's true leanings. They watch the voting records closely and know that this rich young man is truly dependable when the roll is called in the Senate.

What does the record show?

Congressional Quarterly, a non-partisan publication, has listed 97 roll call votes in the 1958 and 1959 sessions as reflecting key issues. On those 97 tests, Humphrey and Kennedy found themselves in harmonious agreement 93 times.

The two candidates stood firmly together on labor issues (14 votes); housing (10 votes); welfare programs (6 votes); domestic aid and aid to education (11 votes). They marched together on legislation affecting civil rights; curbing the Supreme Court; Communist bloc policies; foreign aid; treaties and Presidential nominations.

One method of ascertaining a Senator's position on legislation is based on his "party unity" record. This

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reflects the percentage of times he votes in agreement with the majority of his party. Humphrey and Kennedy are practically indistinguishable under this standard. Humphrey's percentage was 69; Kennedy's was 70.

It is when an examination is made of voting records in the years prior to the 1958-1959 session that Kennedy's almost dramatic conversion to all-out leftism is brought to light. At 35, his age when he entered the Senate, he was considerably farther to the right than he is now at 42.

Thus, on 86 key votes between 1953 and 1958, Kennedy and Humphrey clashed no less than 26 times, most of them in the earlier years. Most of these opposing votes were recorded on farm legislation and extension of the reciprocal trade act. Kennedy supported the peril-point and other protectionist sections of the trade act which Humphrey fought to kill. Kennedy also voted for cuts in conservation funds, flexible price supports and enforcement of acreage allotments in opposition to Humphrey.

But these disputes disappeared with the opening of of the 1958 session. On the most recent test last year, in connection with farm legislation, the two candidates were firmly allied.

One of Kennedy's most spectacular achievements has been the propagation of an impression that he displayed his independence of labor bosses in 1959 by helping to steer to passage the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill, a reform measure which contained some provisions irksome to organized labor.

Tart statements concerning his role have come from George Meany and Walter Reuther, commanders of the AFL-CIO. Senator Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.) has sniped at Kennedy for "betraying" labor.

This may be accepted as a cover-up secretly welcomed by the Kennedy forces. The Senate record shows that Kennedy helped strip the bill of most provisions offensive to the labor chiefs before it came to a final vote. He helped to kill the bill of rights amendment, limits on picketing, tightening of the secondary boycotts ban, limits on trusteeships, secret ballots on strike votes and state jurisdiction in no-man's-land cases.

Kennedy has a 100 per cent voting record on inflationary measures designed to continue deep and devastating Budget deficits. He has vociferously criticized President Eisenhower for vetoes which kept many of these bills from becoming law.

The author of *Profiles in Courage* has adopted a course of utmost caution in the field of international relations whenever controversy arises. He had his first opportunity to take a stand in 1953 when the Status of Forces treaty was up for Senate approval.

This treaty, subjecting American soldiers abroad to the vagaries of foreign justice, was highly unpopular in Massachusetts. Kennedy never showed up for the final vote and did not record an opinion, either by pairing or announcement.

His most notorious ducking of a highly controversial issue came in 1954 when the late Senator Joe McCarthy was up for censure. All members of the Senate except Kennedy and Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, who "abstained" by taking off on a junket, were recorded, either by voting or pairs on the final roll call.

Kennedy was recuperating in a Florida hospital at the time from an illness. Other Senators, necessarily absent by sickness or official duty, made their positions known. A common practice under such circumstances is to have the party leader announce that if the Senator were able to be present and vote, he would vote in the affirmative or negative.

Kennedy remained silent. He kept his position secret for five years, finally stating under questioning recently that he would have voted for censure. If that position had been earlier known in Massachusetts, where McCarthy was a hero to great numbers of voters, Kennedy might not have rolled up in 1958 the greatest vote in the state's history.

KENNEDY'S RECORD on Presidential nominations has gained him the beaming approval of the ADA. He joined the smear campaign which resulted in the Senate's rejection of Admiral Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. He supported Charles E. Bohlen for an ambassadorial post and voted against the nomination of Scott McLeod, militant anti-Communist, for another.

As leader of the campaign to abolish the student loyalty oath in the educational aid program, Kennedy enjoys the blessing of those academic groups which regard disavowal of Communist associations as an invasion of individual rights. He has voted consistently for aid to Communist satellite states, such as Yugoslavia and Poland, and opposed a bar on the sale of farm surpluses to the Communist bloc.

The *New Republic*, a leftist journal, acclaims the Kennedy campaign as "brilliantly conceived and executed." He has been able, the editor acutely observes, to convey the impression that "he is both liberal and respectable."

For "respectable," read "conservative," and you have the Kennedy strategy in a nutshell.

It has worked well in the past and it could carry the Senator to victory at the Los Angeles convention. Thereafter, the going could get rough. Vice President Nixon may well recall the advice of the eminently practical Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York and himself a Presidential candidate in 1928. Al Smith used to bark: "Let's look at the record."

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "KENNEDY'S RECORD IS LIKE HUMPHREY'S" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 16 April 21, 1960 Section 1 — News

GOLDWATER: *His support mounts* ..... (page 1)

TRUMAN: *Planning a comeback?* ..... (page 1)

LODGE: *Reminder to Republicans* ..... (page 2)

LABOR: *Watchdog subcommittee* ..... (page 3)

KHRUSHCHEV: *New Soviet atrocities* (page 3)

Goldwater: The Senator from Arizona still maintains his lead in the HUMAN EVENTS poll of GOP chairmen on their choice of a Vice-Presidential candidate, as announced in these columns last week. In Washington, where many pros have their ears to the ground, less surprise about the Goldwater success is felt, for two reasons:

(1) The reluctance of much of the press to give a conservative any breaks at all—hence the rising tide of sentiment for the Arizonan remained concealed from the country at large.

(2) The knowledge in the Capital that Goldwater has been seeing more of the Republican pros in all parts of the country, more even than has Nixon, helps to explain the large vote he received in the poll.

It is estimated that in the past four months the Senator (who is head of the GOP Senatorial Campaign Committee) has given—on the average—one speech every other day to party gatherings. And, of course, Goldwater speaks the language the pros in all states like to hear.

Among the many interpretations of the figures in the HUMAN EVENTS poll, that of Raymond Moley, national magazine and newspaper columnist, expresses a common reaction: that it shows a considerable majority of the party workers prefer a conservative candidate for Vice President rather than a "liberal" candidate.

Moley cites this result as a refutation of the advice offered to Nixon by the "liberal" claque of columnists—that Nixon should offer a "liberal" image in order to win "independent" voters. Says Moley: "To trim the sails of the Republican candidate and his platform to please these so-called 'independents' would be on the assumption that the regular party members are 'in the bag' and would have to support the ticket."

The regulars would do so, but not "with their hearts," observes Moley. It is the enthusiasm and zeal of party workers, he says, "that brings out the margin of lazy and indifferent voters to win an election."

Additionally, Moley points out that "tens of thousands of business men," pledged to get out the vote and give funds, cannot be ignored. To chill party workers and businessmen by a "swing to the left," he warns, would be "disastrous."

"This is something that Vice President Nixon must consider when he hears from those who tell him fairy tales about winning 'independents' and Democrats by trying to outpromise the Democratic candidate, whoever he may be."

The Goldwater bandwagon draws recruits. Last week, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans, comprising delegates from 13 states, met in Des Moines and passed a resolution urging Goldwater for the Vice-Presidential nomination. At the same time, State Senator John W. Lewis, of Illinois, urged the same course. Lewis said that if he is a delegate-at-large to the GOP convention, he will support Goldwater for Vice President. He described the Arizona Senator as the Republican party's outstanding spokesman for American conservatism.

Other signs in the West: it is reliably reported that the Arizona Republican party organization will pledge its delegates for its famous Senator for the Presidential nomination. (On March 26, the South Carolina GOP did likewise.) It is also reported that the GOP in three other prairie and mountain states will pledge delegations to Goldwater for a place on the national ticket.

Candidate?: Inside the family of Democratic leaders, there is much talk—some startled, some pensive, some humorous—concerning the private remarks of former President Harry Truman about the Democratic nomination race.

Believe it or not, the most famous inhabitant of Independence, Mo., doesn't think much of any of the candidates and believes he could win the election if nominated. It is also reported that he would like to run "just to beat Nixon," towards whom he nurses an abiding hatred. Additionally, he'd like to win so as to pardon Matthew Connelly, his former White House secretary, who HST says was unjustly convicted of conspiring to defraud the Government of his services and whose last appeal to the Supreme Court was turned down recently.

Truman—according to friends—believes he could win the entire Midwest, much as he did in his fiery 1948 whistle stop campaign that toppled states regarded as sure in the Republican column. Harry is aware of the uproar against Benson in the prairies.

He also is confident that the South would take to him now, especially if it cannot get Senator Lyndon Johnson. And he wistfully claims he could get back many votes in New York state which he lost in '48, throwing the Empire State to Dewey. In fact, Truman apparently regrets that Ike isn't

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS • In Four Sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

running this year, because he thinks he could beat him.

Whatever interpretation can be given to this "profile of HST 1960," it certainly helps to explain why the victor of 1948 shows so little enthusiasm for any of the hopefuls in the nomination race, fellow Missourian Symington included. In fact, Harry has no favorite candidate—except himself.

Capitol Camera: Diplomatic Row punsters cite de Gaulle's deft handling of Khrushchev and quip that Ike might do well to give his proxy for the Summit meeting to "Big Charlie."

• *Dick Nixon opposes the Connally Reservation, but his ex-aide Murray Chotiner came out against its repeal while campaigning in a California GOP Congressional primary.*

• Herbert Hoover has become a member of the board of trustees of Americans for Constitutional Action.

• *Three thousand US citizens have abandoned residence in Cuba since the Castro regime took over.*

• On the 15th anniversary of FDR's death last week a special Moscow broadcast called him the greatest president the US ever had.

• *John L. Lewis has joined with West Virginia Senator Robert Byrd to "stop Kennedy" in that state's May 10 primary.*

• Scripps-Howard's Robert Ruark is receiving Capitol Hill praise for his singularly fair reporting of South African race matters.

• *Anti-Communists mourn the death of Alfred Kohlberg, tireless fighter for a free China.*

Candidates: A number of conservatives have entered Congressional and gubernatorial races. Jack Cox of Texas runs strong against Governor Price Daniel by asserting the state needs a sales tax to balance the budget after four years under "spendthrift" Daniel. Iowa State Representative Kenneth Stringer is running against three GOP rivals on a strict economy-in-Government platform and gains support for the seat Senator Thomas Martin is vacating.

Rockefeller: As the New York Governor continues his cryptic attitude toward Vice President Nixon, Republican high commanders in the Nation's Capital agree on two things regarding Nelson: He wants his party's Presidential nomination and he definitely does not want the Vice Presidential spot.

Still courting ambitions for top place on the ticket, Rocky now plans four major speeches on domestic and foreign affairs.

These speeches will be scrutinized closely by people in the political know, not only because they will be given by Rockefeller, but in view of the "ghost" behind them—Rockefeller's policy adviser Emmet John Hughes.

As reported in HUMAN EVENTS March 31, Hughes last December told the New York *Post* that he would vote for a Democratic Presidential nominee over Nixon and favors the election of a strong Democratic Congress.

Chief indicator of the Hughes thinking, which insiders expect to appear in generous doses when Rockefeller speaks, is the adviser's recently published book, *America the Vincible* (reviewed in HUMAN EVENTS December 30, 1959). Although critical of Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler, Hughes calls for appeasement of Soviet Russia in both Europe and Asia. He opposes "stubborn" defense of "indefensible" islands (i.e., Quemoy and Matsu) and hints at eventual recognition of Red China. Hughes cites situations where free institutions have compromised with communism, and in the case of the Polish "compromise" says that it "commends itself, at least for consideration, to the globe."

The Hughes philosophy is considered doubly dangerous, observers note, because Rocky is known to be highly susceptible to "egghead" advisers of leftist persuasion. Many think he cannot help but fall well under the influence of Emmet John Hughes —who is now referred to as "the Milton Eisenhower of Albany."

Jersey Primary: Reports from the Garden State last week were that incumbent Republican Senator Clifford Case, fighting for renomination against a strong bid by Bob Morris, was further alienating GOP regulars and pushing himself foursquare into the "liberal" camp.

Case dubbed conservative Republicans as "the old-fashioned McKinleyites" who wished to return the party to "the dark ages of American history" (when we had a tiny Federal debt and no income tax).

Morris, for his part, spurned this Case "me-too liberalism." He cut a sharper image of himself as an economy advocate and Sound Dollar man, scoring big Government non-defense spending. He showed that in the last six years non-defense spending has increased 43 per cent.

"Rises in tax rates are caused by increased costs of municipal government," Morris states. "The whole inflation spiral which brings on these increased costs of municipal government is set in motion by heavy spending in Washington."

Lodge: Comments come in from high Republican politicos in the wake of UN Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's strong second place run to Barry Goldwater in a HUMAN EVENTS Vice-Presidential preference poll. The thinking of these practical pros is that county chairmen backing Lodge may well possess short political memories regarding the Boston Back Bay diplomat.

They point out that, if Senator Kennedy is on the Democratic ticket, Lodge's VP nomination would have the GOP sporting the man who lost to Kennedy in the memorable Eisenhower sweep of 1952. Ike carried Massachusetts by 209,000 votes but Lodge lost his Senate seat to Kennedy by 70,000 votes in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the few unsuccessful Republican campaigns that year.

If Kennedy is denied a place on his party's ticket, the thinking goes, many of the young candidate's partisans will be tempted to vote Republican as a rebuke to the Democrats. Therefore, to put Lodge on the ticket would be superfluous—the GOP would get the "sour grapes" vote anyhow, and Lodge, in view of his unpopularity in Massachusetts, would prove no asset.

A major sore spot with Republicans regarding Lodge was revived this week when a prominent Massachusetts editor told HUMAN EVENTS: "Up here we haven't forgotten the manner in which Lodge engineered the 'Taft can't win' campaign at the 1952 Chicago convention. Lodge at the time was teamed with Sherman Adams, and the two did quite a hatchet job on Taft. Adams so completely misrepresented Taft's record on foreign policy that our paper took him to task for it and obtained Sherman's written apology. The 'stop thief' chant used against Taft in regard to the seating of delegates was a Lodge brainchild."

Regarding Lodge's Senate record on the Taft-Hartley bill, he voted for the legislation in 1947, the year it passed, but voted against it six times in 1949 when Northern Democrats sought repeal and Lodge was wooing (with little success) the labor bosses.

Although some sources refer to Cabot as a conservative, a look at his voting record for his last two years in Congress gives a fair indication of his true political posture. In 1951 Lodge voted "right" with the socialistic ADA's ratings on eight of 12 key issues. In 1952 he went along with that extreme leftist group seven of 13 times.

Labor Front: Conservatives have hailed the Senate's action in turning over the records of the McClellan labor investigating committee to the Government Operations Investigations subcommittee, also headed by the Arkansas Senator.

McClellan's subcommittee will serve as a watchdog on labor racketeering and similar activities, thus assuring that some attention will continue to be given to labor activities even though the old investigating committee has been disbanded. It will also attempt to spur Secretary of Labor Mitchell and his department to get prosecution of labor union abuses —a necessary task, for Mitchell is not an enthusiast for the new labor law.

The subcommittee includes four members of the original labor investigators: McClellan himself and Senators Ervin (D.-N.C.), Mundt (R.-S.D.) and Curtis (R.-Neb.), as well as two northern "liberals," Jackson (D.-Wash.) and Muskie (D.-Me.). Capitol Hill has high hopes that these Senators will continue the good work begun by the old committee, and will watch for violations of the new Landrum-Griffin labor law.

• Another example of "union democracy" is reported in Alabama, where an official of a Birmingham local of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers proposed that firemen should gradually be eliminated from trains which no longer need them, and suggested that railroad management, which is plagued by this and other kinds of featherbedding, might have some justification for its position. He was promptly given two days to resign or be disciplined—for exercising his right of free speech! (For an even more flagrant case of union totalitarianism, see this week's article, "The 'Crime' of Free Speech," by Richard Whalen.)

Khrushchev's Crimes: While the Milton Eisenhower-"Chip" Bohlen clique continues to picture Nikita Khrushchev as somehow "different" from Stalin, and a man who can be dealt with, recent reports reveal the Soviet dictator to be as ruthless, bloody and treacherous as his predecessor.

An April 2 UPI dispatch, for example, tells how Soviet army troops last year crushed a rebellion of young Communist Pioneers at Temir-Tau in the Republic of Kazakhstan, killing more than 100 *youths and wounding* 1000 *more.*

Hearings just released by the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal similar suppression by Khrushchev in Soviet Georgia and Bulgaria.

In 1956, more than 600 students who had peacefully assembled in Tiflis, the capital of Georgia, were enclosed by Soviet tanks and, with no avenue of escape, leaped to their deaths into the Kura river running through the city, according to Guivy Zaldastani, head of the Georgian National Alliance to free Georgia from Soviet rule. The students had demanded individual liberties and the removal of Khrushchev, said Zaldastani.

A native of Soviet Georgia and a Harvard graduate, Zaldastani also reported that two boys and a girl, who set up a transmitter which told the free world of the revolt, were bayonetted to death. The man who suppressed the revolt, V. P. Mzhavanadze, was later promoted by Khrushchev, he said.

Another native of Georgia, George Nakashidse, summed up Khrushchev this way: "As a member of the 'almighty' Politburo since 1939, Khrushchev is one of the instigators and executors of the barbarous massacres of the Ukrainian Vinnitsa, of the Polish Katyn, of the cruel merciless expulsion of the Caucasian nations—Chechen Ingushes, Karachay-Balkars, Crimean Tartars and Kalmyks—from their native countries to Siberia and Central Asia.

"His really bloodthirsty nature was revealed at the time of the Hungarian uprising [where he] solemnly pledged to fulfill the Hungarian nation's demand, and to withdraw the Russian troops from Budapest and Hungary . . . . The whole world knows what happened then, how Khrushchev 'fulfilled' this promise that he had made public."

WILLIAM H. BATES, Member of Congress from Massachusetts: "I have enjoyed, and been stimulated by, HUMAN EVENTS for many years. Keep up the good work."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Health, Education? Welfare: "The way to a student's mind is through his stomach," seems to be the new slogan of the Education Division of the Health, Education and Welfare Department.

Under the National Defense Education Act, Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick already has awarded several fellowships to students for higher learning in Home Economics (See HUMAN EVENTS, February 18).

And now tucked neatly away in the $4.2 billion appropriation bill for HEW pending before the Senate is an item which will provide Howard University in the Nation's Capital with a $1,433,000 Home Economics building for scholars of cookery. The building has been recommended by "culinary" Commissioner Derthick, whose department said it was necessary so Howard could keep up with all the other colleges with Home Economics buildings.

However, HUMAN EVENTS reporters have discovered that three of the four other universities in Washington do not have Home Economics buildings, and learned from Howard officials that their needs are for dormitory space, not cooking laboratories.

Commissioner Derthick, it is also noted, is now plumping for a $25 billion school building program in the next decade. Many economy-minded Congressmen want to know just how many Home Economics buildings this includes.

• But HEW is not only interested in cooking. On January 1, 1960 it donated a $33,101 sociology grant to the Israel Institute of Applied Research, Jerusalem, Israel. The research grant, reports Congressman H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa), was for the purpose of making:

"A test of husband and wife relationship. The aim is to develop a diagnostic pictorial test of intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role of relationship of husband and wife . . . . "

Joe Kennedy And His Boy

by Westbrook Pegler

I write of the Kennedys, Joe, Jack and Bobby, on the authority of a personal opinion which I have learned is not mine alone.

I had sojourns in the New England Baptist Hospital where the Lahey Clinic carries on much of its work and where, occasionally, Joe, and quite frequently, Jack, are patients.

Joe and I had some amusing hours, including one when he gave me, almost verbatim, the text of the dirty letter which Harry Truman had written to Bernard Baruch in the 1948 campaign. With Joe sitting by, I phoned Baruch in New York and needled him until he was hopping mad at Truman. He not only confirmed the gist and some phrases of the Truman letter, but added in an angry voice that Truman was a "rude, uncouth, ignorant man." But next day he accused me of breaking confidence. I told him what I thought and that was the last between us.

Baruch was so used to the reverence engendered by his title of elder statesman that he was severely jolted. Only Truman in that letter, and his friend, F. D. Roosevelt, who called him a nasty name, had shaken him worse. F.D.R.'s ill temper sent him down to General Hugh Johnson's office on that occasion where his lamentations raised such a fuss that people popped their heads out of other offices into the corridor.

That night in the hospital I cut off my phone and warned all connected with me in New York to keep out of communication. I knew Baruch would call and try to kill the story. He did try, leaving messages all over, but Joe Kennedy, sitting by, had heard enough of my side of the discussion to know that I had refused to accept Baruch's remarks in confidence.

Kennedy's opinion of Baruch was about the same as mine, but he actively detested Herbie Swope, who was BMB's press agent, and exulted in a coup by which he had managed to deal Herbie out of a big profit in Scotch whiskey. Joe had cleaned up enormously in this by-product of his job at the London Embassy and Jimmy Roosevelt also walked off with a bundle, but from insurance on the booze. Thus Joe was able to deny with clinical honesty that Jimmy made any money out of the actual whiskey.

During one of my sojourns in the hospital I came down with a passing crush on Jack Kennedy because of his conduct as master of a small naval vessel which was sunk in Japanese waters. I accepted Jack's own version as handed to me by his father. I have no evidence to dilute his heroism except a dramatic failure of his moral courage in his repudiation of Joe McCarthy long after Joe was in his grave. Senator Kennedy had written a book in tribute to the moral courage shown by American public men in trying situations and now his betrayal of Joe McCarthy came as the most sordid act of the kind in all experience.

Jack's old man, Joe Kennedy, directly asked me to persuade Joe McCarthy to stay out of Boston when the Republicans were hounding McCarthy to go up there and speak for Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. I suggested to McCarthy that he go out to Indiana instead and help Senator William Jenner, a real Republican.

McCarthy did.

Not long earlier, Joe Kennedy had sent an amount, I believe $3,000, to Wisconsin for McCarthy's primary. Joe K's obvious purpose, as I realized later, was to put McCarthy under obligations to return the favor.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.

For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors
JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 16 — Section IV HUMAN EVENTS April 21, 1960

The 'Crime' of Free Speech

How Three California Workers Are Being Persecuted

By Richard Whalen

With a stroke of his pen, a judge in California recently deleted the First Amendment from the Constitution, stripped two American citizens of their birthright of free speech and pushed 15 million union members along the road to political serfdom.

The judge accomplished this massive mischief by signing an order upholding the right of a union to expel members who dissent publicly from union policy. Such men, said the judge, are "disloyal" and the union may properly protect itself by expelling them. What the judge left unsaid is plain enough: the union member must learn to swallow his convictions and agree with his labor bosses if he wishes to keep the union card that is often an indispensable passport to employment.

Thus, the closed mouth logically follows the closed shop. The right of every American to speak freely on public issues, explicitly guaranteed by the First Amendment, must give way to the iron law of "union security."

The doctrine of "union security" reared its totalitarian head in California two years ago, when Proposition 18—a proposed right-to-work law—was offered the voters. In Proposition 18, championed by then Senator William F. Knowland, the labor oligarchy saw a clear threat to compulsory unionism, the source of their power. From Washington's swank AFL-CIO headquarters a multi-million dollar propaganda attack was unleashed against the subversive notion that an American citizen should be free to choose whether or not to join a labor union. A 133-page booklet, *Union Security—the Case Against Right-to-Work Laws,* gave the closed shop a moral guise:

> **"There is only one guiding principle involved in union security. The good of the many is of greater moral value than the good of the individual. This proposition is the root principle of democracy. It is what gives moral value to the principle of majority rule."**

Taken down from its lofty perch, the moral philosophy of the AFL-CIO could be reduced to a single principle: union democracy is possible only if the dissenting minority is suppressed. This profoundly un-American "principle" was ruthlessly practiced in California. The "good" of the mob calling itself the "majority" was advanced by crushing a few hapless individuals, who were "evil" because they disagreed.

Following the lead of the parent International Association of Machinists (IAM), California's District Lodge 727 joined the solid union front against Proposition 18 and Republican gubernatorial candidate Knowland. Billboards, newspaper ads, pamphlets, radio and television "spots"—all shrilly denounced "union-busting" Proposition 18 and its GOP champion. But not all of District 727's 20,000 members were afraid of free choice. Among those who saw no threat to "union security" in the right-to-work laws were Cecil L. Mitchell, John Mulgrew and Edward Ferguson. Skilled workers employed at Lockheed Aircraft's Burbank plant, the men were veteran unionists. Mitchell, in fact, had even been vice president of District 727.

These men were no "scabs" or "labor spies," but decent unionists who took to the stump in support of honest convictions. Explaining why he and his friends believed in right-to-work legislation, Mitchell said:

"We were doing what we felt would strengthen our organization. We backed Proposition 18 because we were convinced that if we didn't do something to clean up our unions, they would die of self-destruction or eventually destroy our democratic form of government."

Despite the efforts of Mitchell and other dissenters, the union campaign spearheaded by the Committee on Political Education (COPE) buried Proposition 18 and installed submissive Democrat Edmund G. ("Pat") Brown in the statehouse at Sacramento. Flushed with victory, the IAM craved vengeance against those who had dared to disobey. Mitchell, Mulgrew and Ferguson were promptly hauled before a trial board of their local on charges of "disloyalty" and "conduct unbecoming a member of the IAM." Their "crimes": making speeches and distributing pamphlets in support of Proposition 18.

The men freely admitted their activities, but argued that they enjoyed the right of free speech as American citizens.

The trial board, ignoring the Constitution, enforced the law of "union security." The men were

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expelled from the IAM. They appealed the ouster to IAM President Al Hayes, whose reply should send a shiver along the spine of every union member who believes the First Amendment still applies to him:

> **"While it is agreed that the right freely to express one's views is a privilege guaranteed by the Constitution, this does not mean that a member of our Association is entitled to openly denounce the considered position of the labor movement . . . without the possibility of losing his rights to retain his standing as an IAM member."**

If Al Hayes were president of the International Association of Moon-Gazers, reflecting on the expulsion of members who had denounced moon-gazing as insanity, he might have a point. But Mr. Hayes and his fellow labor oligarchs are seeking life-and-death power over their followers by means of the closed shop. If Mr. Hayes had his way, a machinist who did not belong to his union would not operate a machine. That sort of power, exercised by a private organization, is a public menace. It must be subject to the same constitutional restraints imposed on other institutions, including protection of minority rights.

At present, Mr. Hayes, while regally denying the plea of the California petitioners, is free to warn his followers that they enjoy only the right to ratify "the considered position of the labor movement." Given the woeful condition of union democracy, painstakingly outlined during the lengthy McClellan Committee hearings, the consensus of the AFL-CIO generally resembles a decree handed down by the the ruling oligarchy of Moscow, Peiping or Havana more than it resembles the American ideal of "consent of the governed."

Yet Al Hayes' remarkable reading of the Constitution was upheld by Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Jesse Jones Frampton, who denied the expelled machinists' suit for reinstatement on the ground that a union may protect itself against "disloyal" members. (Ferguson did not join in the suit, but may file later.) Fortunately, an open shop prevails at Lockheed; as long as the men can endure the insults of one-time Lodge "brothers," they may work. But if they are forced away, what employer will risk hiring "enemies" of the powerful and vengeful IAM? Judge Frampton overlooked the question; Mitchell, Mulgrew and Ferguson surely have not.

Almost certainly, the California case ultimately will lie before the US Supreme Court. Mr. Chief Justice Warren and his colleagues, who have zealously guarded the civil rights of rapists and Communists, will then be faced with the issue posed by attorney Edwin H. Franzen before Judge Frampton: "Whether a union should be allowed to control the action of its members when a public political issue is involved." If so, argued the youthful lawyer, "then our type of government is ending."

A clue to the Court's likely response may be provided by another case now under review. Before adjournment this year, the Court will rule on a decision of the Georgia Supreme Court that compulsory union membership is unconstitutional if dues money is used for political purposes without the consent of union members. The suit was brought by six railroad workers who are determined to spend their political dollars as they see fit, not as COPE dictates. Aware of the dynamite they must handle, the politically acute Justices are not eager to see the Georgia case come up on the calendar. But the showdown is inevitable.

Meanwhile, Americans who are exhorted daily to care for far-off nations that want bread and freedom should be better informed about their neighbors who must give up freedom to earn their daily bread. Cecil Mitchell, John Mulgrew, Edward Ferguson and the railroad men of Georgia are but a symbolic handful of Americans who are still fighting for freedom in the self-proclaimed "land of the free." And there are thousands of other men and women struggling in the shadows of union bossism. The mountain of letters received from rank-and-file union members by the McClellan Committee is grim testimony of the conflict between "union security" and individual liberty.

Ironically, a committee of prominent Americans headed by ardently pro-labor poet and pamphleteer Archibald MacLeish framed the best reply to the arguments of Al Hayes & Company. "Freedom," wrote MacLeish's committee, "is the right to choose. Without possibility of choice and the exercise of choice a man is not a man but a member, an instrument, a thing."

Until that freedom prevails for all Americans, the unions may be "secure" but the Nation will not be.

Richard Whalen is a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS. His last article, "The Greatest Giveaway," appeared May 6, 1959.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE 'CRIME' OF FREE SPEECH" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED